



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

utes late, and thereby is unable to keep his engagement, cannot recover from the carrier his loss occasioned thereby, though he may have made known to the carrier's agent his engagement, and may have been told that the train would arrive on time. The carrier's obligation to run its train in conformity to schedule is not an absolute and unconditional one, and the mere taking of a ticket does not of itself prove a contract or impose the duty to have a train ready to start as scheduled. Furthermore, a ticket agent cannot make a special contract that a train will arrive on time.

Trained Nurse Not a Servant.—A trained nurse performing her usual duties, and exercising the skill which is the result of training in her profession, does not, according to the decision of the United States Circuit Court for the District of Rhode Island, in *Parkes v. Seasongood*, 152 Federal Reporter, 583, come within the definition of a "servant," but rather is one who renders personal services to an employer in an independent calling.

Civil Judgment as Evidence in Prosecution for Embezzlement.—A nice point as to the admissibility of evidence is decided by the Texas Court of Criminal Appeals in *Busby v. State*, 103 Southwestern Reporter, 638. This was a prosecution for embezzlement of state funds by an employee of the state. Prior to the trial of the criminal case, the state had obtained a judgment in a civil action by it against accused and his bondsmen. This judgment was admitted in evidence against accused in the criminal case. On the original hearing the court held that the judgment was admissible, but on rehearing it arrives at a different conclusion; Judge Brooks, however, dissenting. As principal authorities for the decision on rehearing, the court cites *Queen v. Mareau*, 11 A. & E. 128; *Britton v. State*, 77 Ala. 202.

Stare Decisis.—A case forcibly illustrating the legislative department's reluctance to remedy defects in the law disclosed by judicial decisions is that of *People v. Tomplins*, 79 Northeastern Reporter, 326. In this case the Court of Appeals of New York reaffirms the doctrine of *McCord v. People*, 46 New York, 470, that a prosecution for larceny by false pretenses cannot be sustained where the person parting with his property or money does so for any legal purposes. The court admits that the weight of authority is to the contrary, but feels bound to follow the doctrine as settled by the earlier decision, the duty of making a change resting with the Legislature, and says that to change the existing rule would, in effect, be enacting an ex post facto law.